IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.3567 OF 2004

Macchindra Rambhau Jadhav .. Petitioner.

V/s.

The Commissioner, Navi Mumbai
Municipal Corporation & Others .. Respondents.

Mr.A.G. Toraskar for the petitioner.

Mr.R.M. Savant for respondent No.2.

Mr.P.M. Patil, AGP for resopndent Nos.3 and 4.

CORAM : R.M. LODHA &
NARESH H. PATIL, JJ.

DATED : 8TH AUGUST, 2006.

P.C. :

Heard Mr.A.G. Toraskar, advocate for the petitioner.

2. The petitioner prays that the respondents be directed to appoint him to the post of Labour and Administrative Officer. His case is that the respondent No.1 issued an advertisement for walk-in-interview on February 1, 2003 inter alia for the post of Labour and Administrative Officer. He gave interview for the said post on February 1, 2003. He also took written test for the said post on the same day. According to him, his performance was good amongst the candidates interviewed for the said post. He claims that after the interviews

were over, the respondent No.1 declared that he was the best candidate amongst the candidates for the post of Labour and Administrative Officer. However, no appointment order has been received by him necessitating the present writ petition.

3. We assume the correctness of the statement made by the petitioner that in the interview his performance was good and the respondent No.1 declared that the petitioner is the best candidate amongst the candidates interviewed for the post of Labour and Administrative Officer.

4. However, we are afraid despite that the petitioner cannot claim his appointment to the post of Labour and Administrative Officer as a matter of right, moreso, when the respondent No.1 did not choose to appoint anyone as Labour and Administrative Officer.

5. The relief prayed for by the petitioner cannot be granted. The writ petition is dismissed in limine.

(R.M. LODHA, J.)

(NARESH H. PATIL, J.)